

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are now pending in the application. Claims 8-16 are withdrawn. Claims 17-36 are allowed. Claims 1-2 are rejected. Claims 3-7 are objected to. New claims 37-41 have been added. Minor amendments have been made to the preamble of claims 3-7, to clarify that the claims recite a "controller" in accordance with claim 1. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections to claims 1 and 2 in view of the remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Thornbery (U.S. Pat. No. 2,920,693). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is asserted in the Office Action that the spaced apart operators of claim 1 are readable on elements 20 and 60 of Thornbery. Thornbery discloses a flow interrupter for preventing a main valve member 23 from opening to a main burner 16 while a cocking device is operated (FIG. 1; col. 1, lines 48-72; col. 2, lines 1-21). The main valve member 23 is operable by an operator 28 having a coil 34, through an arm 20 and armature 20'. A shunt lever 60 is pivoted to cause the valve member 23 to shut and to cause a pilot valve 56 to open. The pivoted lever 60 is held in place by a magnet frame 47 and coil 49 through an armature 55. Where the magnet frame 47 and coil 49, while sufficient to hold the armature 55 in attracted position is insufficient to move the armature 55 to attracted position, a manual rest button 65 may be provided (col. 4, lines 10-60; FIG. 1).

To place the flow interrupter of Thornbery in operation, a gas cock 10 is turned to the "On" position, and the reset button 65 is depressed. This causes a stem 68 to swing the lever 60 to cause the pilot burner valve 56 to open (col. 5, lines 7-15). When the pivoted shunt lever 60 contacts pole piece extensions 62, flux through the operator 28 is shunted away from the armature, thus preventing the main valve from being opened (col. 5, lines 16-22). When the magnet frame 47 and coil 49 are energized and hold the armature 55 in attracted position, the reset button 65 is released. This moves the shunt lever 60 from its shunting position, which allows the operator 28 (through coil 34) to automatically operate the main valve 23 (col. 5, lines 23-33). It is apparent, then, that the lever 60 is not moved by the operator 28, but instead is moved by the magnet frame 47, coil 49 and manual reset button 65. In other words, the coil 34 disclosed by Thornbery does not create a magnetic field for moving the lever 60.

In contrast, claim 1 recites a "single coil, two operator controller for simultaneously activating two spaced apart magnetically responsive operators, the controller comprising... a coil...between the operators for creating a magnetic field for moving the...operators." Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the controller recited in claim 1 is not anticipated by the flow interrupter of Thornbery.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Reinicke (U.S. Pat. Nos. 5,404,908 and 5,450,871). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is asserted in the Office Action that elements 26-27 of Reinicke are readable on the two operators recited in claims 1 and 2. Elements 26 and 27 of Reinicke are magnetic components of a U-shaped core which must be secured to the body block 31

(col. 4, lines 28-35). The two spaced legs 26 and 27 comprise pole face regions 26' and 27' which are permanently connected to counterbores 54 and 55, preferably by welding, suggested at 56, 57 (col. 4, lines 36-46; FIGS 1 and 2). Thus it is apparent that the legs 26 and 27 do not move within the body block 31.

In contrast, claim 1 recites "... a coil on the bar, between the operators for creating a magnetic field for moving the magnetically responsive operators" (emphasis supplied). Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the legs 26 and 27 of Reinicke cannot anticipate the operators recited in claim 1.

Also in contrast to Reinicke, claim 2 recites "... a sleeve, ...generally surrounding each operator, in which the operator can move;...and a coil on the bar, between the sleeves, for creating a magnetic field for moving the magnetically responsive operators in the sleeves" (emphasis supplied).

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the controller of claim 1 and the controller of claim 2 are not anticipated by Reinicke.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 3-7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, new independent claim 37 includes the recitations of claims 2 and 3. New claim 38 includes the recitations of claims 2 and 4. New dependent claims 39, 40 and 41 depend from claim 38 and include respectively the recitations of dependent claims 5, 6 and 7 (as amended herein as described above, *i.e.*, to recite a controller in the preamble). Therefore, claims 37-41 should now be in condition for allowance.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7521.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

Dated: March 30, 2004

By: 
Elizabeth D. Odell,
Reg. No. 39,532

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
7700 Bonhomme, Suite 400
St. Louis, Missouri 63105
(314) 726-7500

BKW/EDO/dmkd